



United States  
Department of  
Agriculture

Forest Service  
R10-MB-736c

June 2013



# **Big Thorne Project Thorne Bay Ranger District, Tongass National Forest**

# **Final Environmental Impact Statement**

## **Volume I**



## ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<b>ACHP</b> Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	<b>MMBF</b> Million Board Feet
<b>ACMP</b> Alaska Coastal Management Program	<b>MMI</b> Mass Movement Index
<b>ADCCED</b> Alaska Department of Commerce, Community, and Economic Development	<b>MOU</b> Memorandum of Understanding
<b>ADEC</b> Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation	<b>NAWS</b> Non-agricultural Wage and Salary
<b>ADF&amp;G</b> Alaska Department of Fish and Game	<b>NEPA</b> National Environmental Policy Act
<b>ADNR</b> Alaska Department of Natural Resources	<b>NFMA</b> National Forest Management Act (1976)
<b>AHMU</b> Aquatic Habitat Management Handbook	<b>NFS</b> National Forest System
<b>ANCSA</b> Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (1972)	<b>NHPA</b> National Historic Preservation Act
<b>ANILCA</b> Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (1980)	<b>NMFS</b> National Marine Fisheries Service
<b>ARD</b> Acid Rock Drainage	<b>NOI</b> Notice of Intent
<b>ASQ</b> Allowable Sale Quantity	<b>NPDES</b> National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
<b>ATM</b> Access Travel Management Plan	<b>NRHP</b> National Register of Historic Places
<b>BA</b> Biological Assessment	<b>OBML</b> Objective Maintenance Level
<b>BE</b> Biological Evaluation	<b>OGR</b> Old-growth Reserve
<b>BMP</b> Best Management Practice	<b>OHV</b> Off-highway vehicle
<b>CA</b> Census Area	<b>OPML</b> Operational Maintenance Level
<b>CEQ</b> Council on Environmental Quality	<b>OPMP</b> Office of Management and Permitting
<b>CERCLA</b> Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act	<b>PCT</b> Pre-commercial Thinning
<b>CFR</b> Code of Federal Regulations	<b>PFC</b> Proper Functioning Condition
<b>CMAI</b> Culmination of Mean Annual Increment	<b>PNW</b> Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station
<b>CMT</b> Cultural Modified Tree	<b>POG</b> Productive Old Growth
<b>CO<sub>2</sub></b> Carbon Dioxide	<b>POW</b> Prince of Wales
<b>Corps</b> United States Army Corps of Engineers	<b>RAP</b> Roads Analysis Process
<b>CZMA</b> Coastal Zone Management Act (1972)	<b>RARE II</b> Roadless Area Review and Evaluation
<b>DBH</b> Diameter (of a tree) at Breast Height (about 4.5 feet high)	<b>RAW</b> Reasonable Assurance of Windfirmness
<b>DPS</b> Distinct Population Segment	<b>RCS</b> Road Condition Survey
<b>EIS</b> Environmental Impact Statement	<b>RM</b> Roaded Modified
<b>EFH</b> Essential Fish Habitat	<b>RMA</b> Riparian Management Area
<b>EO</b> Executive Order	<b>RMO</b> Road Management Objective
<b>EPA</b> Environmental Protection Agency	<b>RN</b> Roaded Natural
<b>ESA</b> Endangered Species Act	<b>RNA</b> Research Natural Area
<b>ESI</b> Existing Scenic Integrity	<b>ROD</b> Record of Decision
<b>EVC</b> Existing Visual Conditions	<b>ROS</b> Recreation Opportunity Spectrum
<b>FASTR</b> Financial Analysis Spreadsheet Tool - RV	<b>SDM</b> Size Density Model
<b>FEIS</b> Final Environmental Impact Statement	<b>SEIS</b> Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement
<b>Forest Service</b> United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service	<b>SHPO</b> State Historic Preservation Office
<b>FSH</b> Forest Service Handbook	<b>SIO</b> Scenic Integrity Objective
<b>FSL</b> Forestry Sciences Laboratory	<b>SMS</b> Scenery Management System
<b>FSM</b> Forest Service Manual	<b>SPM</b> Semi-Primitive Motorized
<b>GIS</b> Geographic information system	<b>SPNM</b> Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized
<b>GMU</b> Game Management Unit	<b>TAP</b> Travel Analysis Process
<b>GPS</b> Global Positioning System	<b>TCRA</b> Time Critical Removal Actions
<b>HIS</b> Habitat Suitability Index	<b>TES</b> Threatened, Endangered, Sensitive (species)
<b>HUC</b> Hydrologic Unit Code	<b>TTRA</b> Tongass Timber Reform Act (1990)
<b>IDT</b> Interdisciplinary Team	<b>U</b> Urban
<b>IRA</b> Inventoried Roadless Area	<b>USDA</b> United States Department of Agriculture
<b>ISLES</b> Island Surveys to Locate Endemic Species	<b>USGS</b> United States Geological Survey
<b>LSTA</b> Logging system and transportation analysis	<b>USFWS</b> United States Fish and Wildlife Service
<b>LTF</b> Log Transfer Facility	<b>VAC</b> Visual Absorption Capability
<b>LUD</b> Land Use Designation	<b>VCU</b> Value Comparison Unit
<b>LWD</b> Large Woody Debris	<b>VPR</b> Visual Priority Route
<b>MAF</b> Marine Access Facility	<b>VRM</b> Visual Resource Management
<b>MBF</b> Thousand Board Feet	<b>WAA</b> Wildlife Analysis Area
<b>MIS</b> Management Indicator Species	<b>WIT</b> Watershed Inventory Tracking
<b>ML</b> Maintenance Level	<b>WRP</b> Watershed Restoration Plan
	<b>WSRA</b> Wild and Scenic Rivers Act



United States  
Department of  
Agriculture

Forest  
Service

Alaska Region  
Tongass National Forest

648 Mission Street  
Ketchikan, AK 99901  
Phone: (907) 225-3101  
Fax: (907) 228-6215

File Code: 1950

Date: June 28, 2013

Dear Planning Participant:

Here is your copy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Big Thorne Project on the Thorne Bay Ranger District, Tongass National Forest. This EIS analyzes four action alternatives and a no-action alternative. The action alternatives would make available for harvest between about 84.4 to 175.7 million board feet (MMBF) of sawlog plus utility timber volume, and proposes 0.2 to 13.9 miles of new NFS road construction, 11.2 to 37.5 miles of temporary road construction, and 17.5 to 36.7 miles of road reconstruction. Proposed harvest systems include both clearcutting and single-tree or group selection, and proposed logging systems include both conventional and helicopter.

The significant issues addressed by the alternatives include timber supply and timber sale economics, old-growth habitat LUD modifications, wildlife habitat and subsistence use, and cumulative watershed effects.

Also analyzed is a proposal for a non-significant amendment to the Forest Plan that would modify the location of some small old-growth reserves. The Record of Decision will document my final decision on the Selected Alternative and the facts considered in reaching the decision. The effective date of implementation of the decision and the notice of rights of appeal will also be specified in the ROD.

Copies of the Final EIS have been directly mailed to those people who requested to be on the project mailing list. Copies of this Final EIS area also available for review at Forest Service offices throughout the Tongass and online at:

<http://www.fs.fed.us/r10/tongass/projects/projects.shtml>

For additional information, please contact the Thorne Bay Ranger District at 907-828-3220 during regular business hours, Monday-Friday, 8 am to 4:30 pm.

Sincerely,

FORREST COLE  
Forest Supervisor



# Big Thorne Project

## Final Environmental Impact Statement

### United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service Alaska Region

<b>Lead Agency:</b>	USDA Forest Service Tongass National Forest
<b>Responsible Official:</b>	Forrest Cole, Forest Supervisor Tongass National Forest Federal Building Ketchikan, Alaska 99901
<b>For Information Contact:</b>	Frank Roberts, POW Planning Thorne Bay Ranger District P.O. Box 19001 Thorne Bay, Alaska 99919 (907) 828-3250

---

**Abstract:** The Forest Service proposes to harvest timber, build new roads, and reconstruct roads in the Big Thorne project area on north-central Prince of Wales Island. The project area includes the community of Thorne Bay and is adjacent to Coffman Cove. The actions analyzed in this EIS are designed to implement the Tongass Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan). The EIS describes and analyzes in detail five alternatives, which provide differing outputs and responses to the issues identified for this project. None of the alternatives include entry into inventoried roadless areas.

**Alternative 1 (No Action)** proposes no harvest or roadbuilding activities in the project area at this time. Current and on-going management activities would continue.

**Alternative 2 (Proposed Action)** proposes to harvest about 121 MMBF of timber on about 5,121 old-growth acres, build 32 miles of National Forest System (NFS) and temporary road and reconstruct 18 miles of NFS road. No commercial thinning is included.

**Alternative 3** proposes to harvest about 176 MMBF of timber on about 7,120 old-growth and 2,299 young-growth acres, build 51 miles of NFS and temporary road and reconstruct 37 miles of NFS road. The young growth will be commercially thinned.

**Alternative 4** proposes to harvest about 84 MMBF of timber on about 4,757 old-growth and 1,888 young-growth acres, build 11.5 miles of NFS and temporary road and reconstruct 19 miles of NFS road. The young growth will be commercially thinned.

**Alternative 5** proposes to harvest about 114 MMBF of timber on about 5,452 old-growth and 1,850 young-growth acres, build 17 miles of NFS and temporary road and reconstruct 17.5 miles of NFS road. The young growth will be commercially thinned.

# SUMMARY

## Introduction

The Forest Service has prepared this Final Environmental Impact Statement (Final EIS) to analyze the potential impacts of timber harvesting and road management in the Big Thorne project area. This Final EIS is in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act 42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq. (NEPA), the National Forest Management Act of 1976, and all other relevant Federal and State laws and regulations.

## Project Area

The Big Thorne project area is located in Southeast Alaska on Prince of Wales Island, around the community of Thorne Bay and south of Coffman Cove (see Figure 1-1) and covers approximately 232,000 acres of lands, including about 14,000 acres of State and private lands (non-National Forest System [NFS]) and 218,000 acres of NFS lands. Three land use designations (LUDs) comprise 84 percent of the project area; these consist of Old-Growth Habitat, Timber Production, and Modified Landscape, in descending order of abundance. The Scenic River LUD along the Thorne River-Hatchery Creek system also comprises significant acreage. The remaining LUDs consist of Scenic Viewshed, Recreational River, Research Natural Area, and miscellaneous small acreages. Combined, the three primary timber management LUDs (Timber Production, Modified Landscape, and Scenic Viewshed) comprise about 124,000 of the 218,000 acres of NFS lands in the project area. A fairly extensive road system already exists and an operating medium-sized sawmill exists on the island along with numerous small mills.

These conditions make the area more likely to produce economic and long-term sales. Longer-term sales are the best way to provide sufficient assurance of timber supply to support the necessary investment in new and upgraded manufacturing facilities by the timber industry.

In implementing Forest Plan direction in accordance with the Council of Environmental Quality regulations (40 CFR 1500-1508), this Final EIS answers the following eight questions:

### 1 – What action is proposed?

The proposed action for the Big Thorne Project is to harvest timber on approximately 5,121 acres of forested lands using various sizes of timber sales, offered over multiple years, within the roaded land base on Prince of Wales Island. This harvest would include approximately 593 acres in Phase 2 lands of the Tongass Timber Sale Program Adaptive Management Strategy (USDA Forest Service 2008b), which would be reserved for small timber sales. These Phase 2 lands are included because they are not roadless and are very close to Thorne Bay. Approximately 32 miles of NFS and temporary roads would be constructed and about 18 miles of existing roads would be reconstructed. No harvest or road construction/reconstruction would occur within Inventoried Roadless Areas (IRAs). An estimated 105 million board feet (MMBF) of sawtimber and 16 MMBF of utility

# Summary

volume could be made available to industry for harvest. Existing log transfer facilities would be used as needed. Harvest would include helicopter, ground-based, and cable yarding systems and would include even-aged and uneven-aged harvest prescriptions to achieve stand objectives. The proposed action and the action alternatives would meet the standards and guidelines and accomplish the goals and objectives of the Tongass National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan) (USDA Forest Service 2008a).

Site-specific descriptions and resource considerations for each potential harvest unit were included as unit cards in Appendix B of the Draft EIS; updated unit cards for the Final EIS are located in the project record and cards will be included with the Record of Decision (ROD) for the selected alternative. All roads have been located and will be designed to avoid or minimize effects on wetlands. Resource considerations for each proposed new system road were included in the road cards in Appendix C of the Draft EIS; updated road cards for the Final EIS are located in the project record and cards will be included with the ROD for the selected alternative (40 CFR 1502.4(a); 1508.23; 1502.14; and 1502.5).

## 2 – Why is the project being proposed?

The Big Thorne Project is proposed at this time to respond to goals and objectives of the Forest Plan (USDA Forest Service 2008a), to help move the project area toward the desired conditions described in that plan, and to meet the needs of Southeast Alaska timber operators and residents. The Forest Plan includes both forest-wide goals and objectives and area-specific (LUD) goals, objectives, and desired conditions. The Big Thorne Project would respond to the following Forest Plan goals and objectives:

### **Timber—Goal (USDA Forest Service 2008a, 2-7)**

- § Provide for the continuation of timber uses and resources by the timber industry and Alaska residents.

### **Timber—Objectives (USDA Forest Service 2008a, 2-7)**

- § Seek to provide an economic timber supply sufficient to meet the annual market demand for Tongass National Forest timber, and the market demand for the planning cycle, up to a ceiling of this Plan's allowable sale quantity, which is 2.67 billion board feet in the first decade.
- § Manage young growth to improve habitat for wildlife and commercial timber products.
- § Provide 2-3 years supply of volume under contract to local mills and then establish shelf volume to maintain flexibility and stability in the sale program.
- § Review the timber sale program and work with State and other partners to implement changes that will keep an "economic timber" perspective throughout the process and monitor the implementation of these reforms to ensure they are consistently employed across the Forest.

### **Local and Regional Economy—Goal (USDA Forest Service 2008a, 2-5)**

- § Provide a diversity of opportunities for resource uses that contribute to the local and regional economies of Southeast Alaska.

## **Local and Regional Economy—Objective (USDA Forest Service 2008a, 2-5)**

- § Support a wide range of natural resource employment opportunities within Southeast Alaska communities.

Seeking to meet timber demand for the Tongass National Forest is required by Section 101 of the 1990 Tongass Timber Reform Act (TTRA) which states that, “...to the extent consistent with providing for the multiple use and sustained yield of all renewable forest resources, seek to provide a supply of timber from the Tongass National Forest..” The interdisciplinary team (IDT) for the Big Thorne project found that the timber resources in the project area have potentially high value for local economies.

Southeast Alaska, and locally the Prince of Wales Island area, has experienced a significant decline in timber industry employment, with employment dropping sharply in the 1990s, following the closure of the region’s two pulp mills, and continuing to decrease over the past decade. This decline has been mirrored by a decline in regional sawmill production and reduced harvest levels Forest-wide. Allowing the use of renewable timber resources would provide Southeast Alaska timber operators with the opportunity to generate and support jobs and income in the region (see Issue 1 – Timber Supply and Economics in Chapter 1 and Chapter 3).

In addition, given the relevant Forest Plan goals and objectives and based on analysis of existing conditions in the project area, the interdisciplinary team found that the roaded landscape, tree species composition, and tree quality of the Big Thorne project area provides opportunity for economic timber harvest. Further, because of its central location on the Prince of Wales Island road system, the Big Thorne project area has economic transportation connections to the largest active sawmill and one of the highest concentrations of small operators in Southeast Alaska. Therefore, the Big Thorne project is proposed at this time to respond to the underlying need for a reliable, economic, and long-term timber supply, as well as to respond to the goals and objectives identified for the project area by the Forest Plan and to move the project area toward the desired condition described in the Forest Plan.

The purpose of and need for project action is further explained in Chapter 1 and in greater detail in Appendix A of this document (40 CFR 1502.13).

## **3 – Alternatives: What other action would meet the same need?**

The proposed action, three action alternatives, and a “No Action” alternative have been analyzed in detail. Each action alternative provides a different response to key issues while still meeting the stated purpose and need of this EIS. Each of these action alternatives represents a site-specific proposal developed through an intensive, field-verified, interdisciplinary team evaluation of timber harvest unit and road design.

All action alternatives to the proposed action are consistent with the Forest Plan. All applicable Forest Plan Standards and Guidelines have been incorporated into the design of the proposed units and alternatives. While some alternatives have been designed to provide a greater measure of protection than is required by the Forest Plan for some resources (e.g., spreading out units and modifying prescriptions to reduce effects on

# Summary

wildlife in Alternative 4), all alternatives were designed to meet Forest Plan Standards and Guidelines for all other resources. Additional direction comes from applicable laws and Forest Service manuals and handbooks. Each alternative complies with the Tongass Conservation Strategy designed to ensure the maintenance of viable populations of all vertebrate species on the Tongass by means of a comprehensive approach based on principles of conservation biology (see Issue 3 – Wildlife and Subsistence Use in Chapter 3). Forest Plan Standards and Guidelines for riparian areas are applied to all streams within the project area.

The following is a brief discussion of how the alternatives respond to the key issues identified for the Big Thorne project. A detailed comparison of these issues by project alternative is summarized in Chapter 2, and a full examination of effects of each alternative relative to key issues as well as other resource concerns is provided in Chapter 3. None of the action alternatives include harvest or road construction in IRAs.

## Alternative 1

Alternative 1 is the No Action Alternative in the EIS. Under this alternative, no timber harvest or road building would take place at this time. As a result, this alternative would not meet the purpose and need for the project.

## Alternative 2

Alternative 2 (see “1 – What action is proposed?”) addresses Issue 1 – Timber Supply and Sale Economics, while limiting effects on other issues and resources. It completely avoids harvest or road construction in IRAs. Alternative 2 would meet the purpose and need for the project.

It would produce 105 MMBF of sawtimber plus 16 MMBF of utility volume (121 MMBF total volume) by harvesting 5,121 acres of old growth, building 32 miles of new roads (including formerly decommissioned roads), and reconstructing 18 miles of stored roads. About 8 miles of the new roads would be NFS roads; the remaining new roads would be temporary roads.

## Alternative 3

This alternative gives greatest priority to Issue 1 by emphasizing timber production and addressing timber sale economics. As such, it maximizes the amount of cable and shovel clearcut prescriptions among the alternatives, and includes commercial thinning of 50+ year-old stands. This alternative also adjusts the boundaries of small old-growth reserves (OGRs) outside of IRAs so that more of these OGRs would be placed inside IRAs and the vacated road portions would be designated as Timber Production or Modified Landscape and made available for timber management. It completely avoids harvest or road construction in IRAs. Alternative 3 would meet the purpose and need for the project.

It would produce 155 MMBF of sawtimber and 21 MMBF of utility volume (176 MMBF total volume) by harvesting 7,120 acres of old growth, 2,299 acres of young-growth thinning, building 51 miles of new roads (including formerly decommissioned roads), and reconstructing 37 miles of stored roads. About 14 miles of the new roads would be NFS roads; the remaining new roads would be temporary roads.



## Alternative 4

The primary objective of Alternative 4 is to address Issues 2 and 3, by maintaining landscape connectivity, protecting important wildlife corridors, and reducing impacts to sensitive plants and wildlife. Under this alternative, impacts to biodiversity and wildlife were minimized by selecting harvest methods and prescriptions that would have a lighter touch on the landscape (i.e., resulting in less old-growth removal and less road construction); deferring or modifying boundaries of proposed units that could impact habitat connectivity or impact sensitive plant populations; and positioning legacy forest structure requirements to protect important wildlife habitats.

This alternative also adjusts the boundaries of small OGRs by incorporating the biologically preferred alternative based on an interagency review of small OGRs. Areas vacated by small OGR modifications would be designated as Timber Production or Modified Landscape and made available timber harvest. It completely avoids harvest or road construction in IRAs. Alternative 4 would meet the purpose and need for the project.

Alternative 4 would produce about 75 MMBF of sawtimber and 10 MMBF of utility volume (84 MMBF total volume) by harvesting 4,757 acres of old growth, thinning 1,888 acres of 50+ year-old young growth, building 11.5 miles of new roads (including formerly decommissioned roads), and reconstructing 19 miles of stored roads. Only 0.2 mile of the new roads would be NFS roads; the remaining new roads would be temporary roads.

## Alternative 5

Alternative 5 addresses watershed effects (Issue 4) and other issues raised by minimizing road construction, road-stream crossings, reducing cable or shovel logging, and reducing harvest in watersheds with high levels of harvest within the past 30 years. This alternative increases harvest volume by including commercial thinning units in young-growth stands 50 years of age or older to benefit watershed function. It completely avoids harvest or road construction in IRAs. Alternative 5 would meet the purpose and need for the project.

This alternative would produce about 101 MMBF of sawtimber and 13 MMBF of utility volume (114 MMBF total volume) by harvesting 5,452 acres of old growth, thinning 1,850 acres of 50+ year-old young growth, building 17 miles of new roads (including formerly decommissioned roads) and reconstructing 17.5 miles of stored roads. Only 0.8 mile of the new roads would be NFS roads; the remaining new roads would be temporary roads.

## 4 – What would it mean not to meet the need for project action?

Not meeting the need for timber production in the project area would mean that Forest Plan requirements for continuous yield of timber would have to be met in other areas (see Appendix A – Reasons for Scheduling the Environmental Analysis of the Big Thorne Project). Harvest from micro-sales would continue to occur in the Big Thorne project area if this project does not go forward. However, harvest in this manner does not include a landscape-level approach, does not provide a balanced view of resource needs, and would contribute only a minimal amount of wood fiber to the local and regional economies of Southeast Alaska. In the absence of a long-term (i.e., multi-year) stable supply of

# Summary

economic timber from the Big Thorne Project or elsewhere, the future viability of existing mill operators on Prince of Wales Island and elsewhere in the region would be adversely affected (see Issue 1 – Timber Supply and Economics in Chapter 3) (40 CFR 1508.25(b)(1); and 1502.14(d)).

## 5 – What are the effects of the proposed action, and alternative actions — in comparative format?

The following four issues were determined to be potentially key or significant and within the scope of the project decision. The IDT developed the alternatives to the proposed action to address these issues. Chapter 2, Alternatives, introduces how the alternatives meet the purpose and need for the project, and compares outputs, objectives and effects of the alternatives in terms of the key issues (see Table 2-1, Comparison of Alternatives by Issue). Chapter 3 examines the existing condition and analyzes the effects or consequences of the project as it relates to these issues. The following summarizes these effects:

### ISSUE 1 – Timber Supply and Timber Sale Economics

Each of the four action alternatives is designed to be responsive to the need for a reliable, economic supply of sawtimber to meet market demand. These alternatives also have the potential to support timber industry employment and benefit local and regional economies. Alternative 3 would produce the largest volume of timber, followed by Alternatives 2, 5, and 4 in that order. Assuming constant job/MMBF ratios, the alternatives with more volume would have a higher potential to support employment and income in local economies. Total estimated direct employment ranges from 341 to 386 jobs (annualized job-years) under Alternative 4 to 706 to 816 jobs under Alternative 3, reflecting the relative volumes that would be made available under each alternative. The project would also support indirect jobs within the region.

For timber volume to contribute to the stated purpose, it must also be economically viable. Current indicated bid values are positive for three of the four action alternatives, ranging from about \$7/MBF under Alternative 5 to \$58/MBF under Alternative 2, the proposed action. The indicated bid value for Alternative 4 is negative at -\$13/MBF under current economic assumptions. The quantity of economically viable timber volume available at project implementation would depend on a number of factors. Changes in regional and global timber markets and other factors such as fuel costs can dramatically affect stumpage values and logging costs at the time of implementation and harvest. The full economic benefits of a given alternative may not be available under poor market conditions.

Under Alternative 1 (No Action), there would be no timber volume available for sale through the Big Thorne Project. The project would not meet the purpose and need, which is to contribute to a supply of economic timber to industry on Prince of Wales Island and Southeast Alaska, in general (including both large and small operators), in a manner that is consistent with the multiple-use goals and objectives of the Tongass Forest Plan. The Big Thorne project is intended to provide a supply of economic timber and designed to include sufficient units and volume to allow the Forest Service to adjust future timber sale

# Summary

offerings from the project area to meet fluctuating market conditions, to the extent possible.

A stable and economic timber supply is intended to support local operators and encourage investment in the wood products industry as it transitions to include more young-growth harvesting and restoration activities. Timber from the Big Thorne project would represent a portion of the timber supply available to Southeast Alaska's economy. A stable timber supply in Southeast Alaska depends on the success of many timber sales across the forest. As noted above, in the absence of a long-term (i.e., multi-year) stable supply of economic timber from the Big Thorne project or elsewhere, the future viability of existing mill operators would be adversely affected. Closure of one or more of the existing mills would result in a reduction in direct jobs and could also affect local businesses that support the sawmill sector.

## **ISSUE 2 – Old-growth Habitat LUD Modifications**

Modifications to small old-growth reserves (OGRs) are proposed under Alternatives 3 and 4. Alternative 3 would exchange roaded portions of small OGRs (making these acres available for timber harvest) for substitute acres in IRAs. Alternative 4 would modify the current locations of small OGRs so that they correspond with biologically preferred locations, as identified by an interagency OGR review team. Alternatives 1, 2, and 5 would not modify small OGR boundaries.

Both Alternatives 3 and 4 would result in a net gain in OGR acres (590 acres in Alternative 3 and 4,270 acres in Alternative 4); however, Alternative 3 would reduce the total amount of POG in small OGRs by 843 acres, while Alternative 4 would increase the total amount of POG in small OGRs by 2,029 acres. Alternative 3 would increase the amount of suitable forest land available for timber production by 1,174 acres and Alternative 4 would reduce suitable and available forest land by 1,451 acres.

All existing and modified small OGRs would be consistent with Forest Plan acreage requirements. About half of the small OGR modifications under Alternative 3 would result in a tradeoff between a reduction in the amount of roads and early seral forest included in small OGRs for a reduction in the amount of POG habitats (e.g., deer winter range, goshawk and marbled murrelet nesting habitat, and low elevation old-growth), and sometimes a decrease in areas important for connectivity, included in the OGRs.

Modifications in all small OGRs under Alternative 3 would increase the timber available to the Big Thorne project. Generally, small OGR modifications under Alternative 4 would increase inclusion of POG habitats in the OGRs and encompass important travel corridors, while decreasing forest land available for timber production.

## **ISSUE 3 – Wildlife and Subsistence Use**

Alternative 1 (No Action) would have no direct, indirect, or cumulative effects on wildlife or subsistence use that are associated with the Big Thorne Project. All action alternatives would result in a decrease in productive old-growth (POG) habitat, resulting in a reduction of 5 to 7 percent from current amounts within the project area. Resulting impacts to biodiversity and landscape connectivity (fragmentation) would be greatest under alternatives that harvest the most POG. However, impacts would be reduced under alternatives that incorporate more uneven-aged harvest prescriptions. Likewise, impacts

# Summary

would be less under alternatives that incorporate more helicopter logging than conventional logging systems. Based on acres of POG harvested, the increase in number of POG patches, and the proportion of harvest that would be uneven-aged, Alternative 3 would have the greatest adverse effects to biodiversity, followed by Alternatives 2, 5, 4, and 1.

Reductions in POG would reduce habitat available for marten, goshawks, Prince of Wales flying squirrel, snag-dependent species (red-breasted sapsucker, hairy woodpecker, and brown creeper), spruce grouse, endemic species, migratory birds, and other old-growth associated species. Habitat for these species is maintained by Forest Plan standards and guidelines, riparian buffers, beach and estuary fringe, OGRs, other non-development LUDs, and other aspects of the Forest Plan conservation strategy. Local reductions in populations may occur for these species, either through disturbance, habitat removal, or fragmentation (reduced dispersal and/or population isolation), under all action alternatives.

Removal of low elevation POG under all alternatives would reduce the amount of available deer winter habitat, and thus would reduce deer habitat capability. Currently, deer habitat capability in all of the Wildlife Analysis Areas (WAAs) coinciding with the project falls below the Forest Plan standard of 18 deer per square mile considered necessary to maintain a sustainable wolf population and meet human harvest demands. Further reductions in deer habitat capability resulting from the action alternatives may result in local declines in the deer population, reducing the number of deer available to wolves and subsistence hunters. Although wolves are highly mobile within their territories and some nearby WAAs with higher deer densities would continue to support wolves in the vicinity of the project, wolf mortality has been identified as a concern in project area WAAs.

All action alternatives would increase road density. Current road densities in all the WAAs coinciding with the project are higher than the Forest Plan recommended threshold of 0.7 to 1.0 mile per square mile for areas where wolf mortality has been identified as a concern. Resulting total road densities (NFS and non-NFS lands) range from 1.7 to 2.8 miles per square mile depending on the WAA and alternative. Increased road density indirectly affects wolves, as well as other harvested species (marten and black bears), by increasing human access which may lead to increased harvest rates.

## **ISSUE 4 – Cumulative Watershed Effects**

Alternative 1 (No Action) would have no direct, indirect, or cumulative watershed effects associated with the Big Thorne Project. All action alternatives would result in minor (effects would be measurable, with only small, localized changes to the site, lasting less than a week) to moderate (effects would be measurable at the stream reach or subwatershed scale, and last more than a week) effects on sedimentation and aquatic habitat. Alternative 3 would have the most effects, followed by Alternative 2. Compared to Alternatives 2 and 3, Alternative 4 would have less effect on sedimentation and aquatic habitat. Compared to Alternative 5, Alternative 4 would have less harvest, less new road construction, more reconstruction of ML1 stored roads, and more road-stream crossings (Class I, II, and III), resulting in similar but slightly less effects on sedimentation and aquatic habitat than Alternative 5. Alternative 5 would construct slightly more road miles

than Alternative 4, but substantially less road miles than Alternatives 2 or 3, and have the fewest road-stream crossings (Class I, II, and III) of all the alternatives (40 CFR 1502.14;1508.8;1502.16).

### **6– What factors will be used when making the decision among alternatives?**

The factors that will influence the decision among alternatives include design and location of timber harvest, road construction and reconstruction, social and economic factors: see Issue 1 - Timber Supply and Sale Economics; Issue 2 – Old-Growth Habitat LUD Modifications; Issue 3 – Wildlife Habitat and Subsistence Use; Issue 4 – Cumulative Watershed Effects; and other resource concerns (also see the section Decision Framework in Chapter 1) (40 CFR 1502.23).

### **7 – Are there any ways to mitigate adverse effects?**

Possible adverse impacts may occur from implementing the actions proposed under each alternative. Measures have been formulated to mitigate or reduce these impacts, guided by direction in the Forest Plan. Entire units and partial units have been deleted from further consideration so that impacts can be avoided, because of resource concerns. Adverse effects, such as risks from windthrow to standing timber after harvest, have been evaluated, and means to minimize windthrow, such as windfirm buffers, are incorporated into all harvest unit prescriptions, where needed. If any previously undocumented goshawk nests are discovered at any time prior to or during the implementation of this project, the appropriate protection measures (nest buffers) would be enacted.

Resource specialists from the ID Team used on-the-ground inventories, computer (GIS) data, and aerial photographs to prepare unit cards (Appendix B in the Draft EIS; unit cards for the Final EIS are in the project record) for each harvest unit in the unit pool for the project, and road cards (Appendix C in the Draft EIS; road cards for the Final EIS are in the project record for each segment of road). The cards describe site-specific concerns, and how these concerns would be mitigated or avoided in the design of each unit and road segment.

Resource concerns and mitigation measures may be refined further during final layout, when specialists have another opportunity to refine their unit and road card recommendations.

Some general mitigation common to all alternatives is described in Chapter 2. A more detailed discussion by issue and resource is in Chapter 3 (40 CFR 1508.25(b)(3); 1502.14(f);1502.16(h); 1508.20; and 1500.2(e)).

### **8 – What monitoring is necessary?**

Routine implementation monitoring is part of the administration of a timber sale contract. The sale administrators and road inspectors ensure that the prescriptions contained on the unit and road cards, and the unit silvicultural prescriptions, are incorporated into contract documents; they then monitor performance relative to contract requirements. The unit cards and road cards for the Final EIS alternatives are located in the project record; the Draft EIS unit and road cards were included in Appendices B and C of the Draft EIS,

# Summary

respectively. Input by resource staff specialists, such as fisheries biologists, soil scientists, hydrologists, and engineers, would be regularly requested during this implementation monitoring process. These specialists provide technical advice when questions arise during project implementation.

Tongass National Forest staff annually conducts a review of Best Management Practice (BMP) implementation and effectiveness. The results of this and other monitoring are summarized in a Tongass National Forest Annual Monitoring and Evaluation Report. This report provides information about how well the management direction of the Forest is being carried out and measures the accomplishment of anticipated outputs, activities and effects.

## Final EIS Organization

This Final EIS discloses the direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental impacts that would result from the proposed action and alternatives. All numbers in this document are approximate. The document is organized into four chapters:

- Chapter 1 explains the purpose and need for the proposed action, discusses how the Big Thorne Project relates to the Forest Plan, and identifies the significant, or key, issues driving the EIS analysis.
- Chapter 2 describes the proposed action, compares alternatives to the proposed action including a No-action Alternative, and summarizes the significant environmental consequences by issue.
- Chapter 3 describes the natural and human environments potentially affected by the proposed action and alternatives, and discloses what potential effects are anticipated.
- Chapter 4 contains the list of preparers, the Final EIS distribution list, literature cited, a glossary, and an index.
- Appendices provide additional information on specific aspects of the proposed project.

Copies of this Final EIS may be obtained from the Thorne Bay Ranger District office at Thorne Bay, Alaska. Additional documentation, including more detailed analyses of project area resources, may be found in the project record located at the Thorne Bay Ranger District office.

# Table of Contents

## Volume I

<b>Summary .....</b>	<b>S-1</b>
<b>Chapter 1 – Purpose of and Need for Action .....</b>	<b>1-1</b>
Document Structure .....	1-1
Background .....	1-1
Project Area.....	1-2
Purpose and Need for Action .....	1-4
Purpose .....	1-4
Need .....	1-5
Proposed Action .....	1-5
Decision Framework.....	1-6
Public Involvement .....	1-6
Scoping.....	1-6
Consultation with Federally Recognized Tribal Governments and Tribal Corporations .....	1-7
Other Agency Involvement .....	1-8
State of Alaska .....	1-9
Availability of the Draft EIS .....	1-10
Availability of the Final EIS .....	1-11
Issues .....	1-11
Issue 1 – Timber Supply and Timber Sale Economics .....	1-12
Issue 2 – Old-Growth Habitat LUD Modifications .....	1-12
Issue 3 – Wildlife Habitat and Subsistence Use .....	1-13
Issue 4 – Cumulative Watershed Effects.....	1-14
Other Resource Considerations .....	1-14
Relationship to the Forest Plan .....	1-15
Forest Plan Land Use Designations .....	1-15
Timber Sale Program Adaptive Management Strategy .....	1-18
Other Related Efforts.....	1-19
Stewardship Opportunities in the Project Area.....	1-19
Relationship to the Access Travel Management Plan .....	1-20
Applicable Laws and Executive Orders .....	1-21
Availability of the Project Record .....	1-22
Map and Number Qualification .....	1-22
<b>Chapter 2 – Alternatives, Including the Proposed Action .....</b>	<b>2-1</b>
Introduction.....	2-1
Changes between Draft and Final EIS .....	2-1
Changes to the Alternatives .....	2-1
Stewardship Projects.....	2-2
Changes in Chapter 3 – Environment and Effects.....	2-3
Alternative Development .....	2-5
Alternatives Considered in Detail .....	2-6
Alternative 1 (No Action).....	2-6
Alternative 2 (Proposed Action).....	2-6
Alternative 3.....	2-7
Alternative 4.....	2-10
Alternative 5.....	2-12

# Table of Contents

Identification of the Preferred Alternative .....	2-13
Design Criteria and Mitigation Common to all Action Alternatives .....	2-13
Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Study .....	2-18
No New Roads Alternative .....	2-18
Modification of Small and Large OGRs .....	2-19
Yellow-Cedar Alternative .....	2-19
Small Sales Alternative .....	2-20
Comparison of Alternatives .....	2-21
<b>Chapter 3 – Environment and Effects .....</b>	<b>3-1</b>
Introduction .....	3-1
Land Divisions .....	3-1
Project Area .....	3-1
Value Comparison Units .....	3-1
Game Management Units .....	3-2
Wildlife Analysis Areas .....	3-2
Watershed .....	3-2
Inventoried Roadless Area .....	3-2
Biogeographic Province .....	3-4
Analyzing Effects .....	3-4
Direct, Indirect, and Cumulative Effects .....	3-4
Past, Present and Reasonably Foreseeable Projects .....	3-5
Incomplete and Unavailable Information .....	3-11
Other Resources .....	3-11
Air Quality .....	3-11
Land Status .....	3-12
Community Profiles .....	3-12
Thorne Bay .....	3-12
Coffman Cove .....	3-13
Craig .....	3-13
Hollis .....	3-14
Kasaan .....	3-14
Klawock .....	3-15
Naukati Bay .....	3-15
Environment and Effects of Significant Issues .....	3-16
Issue 1: Timber Supply and Timber Sale Economics .....	3-17
Issue 2: Old-Growth Habitat LUD Modifications .....	3-44
Issue 3: Wildlife and Subsistence Use .....	3-96
Issue 4: Cumulative Watershed Effects .....	3-257
Other Resource Considerations .....	3-312
Karst .....	3-312
Soils .....	3-318
Climate Change .....	3-333
Fisheries .....	3-337
Wetlands .....	3-356
Botany .....	3-371
Invasive Plants .....	3-397
Timber and Vegetation .....	3-410
Transportation .....	3-436
Recreation .....	3-453
Scenery .....	3-475



## Table of Contents

Inventoried Roadless Areas and Wilderness.....	3-493
Wild and Scenic Rivers.....	3-508
Heritage Resources.....	3-511
Socioeconomics .....	3-516
Environmental Justice .....	3-527
Other Environmental Considerations .....	3-529
Relationship between Short-term Uses and Long-term Productivity .....	3-529
Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources.....	3-530
Unavoidable Adverse Environmental Effects .....	3-531

### Volume II

<b>Chapter 4 –References and Lists.....</b>	<b>4-1</b>
List of Preparers .....	4-1
Distribution List.....	4-4
Glossary .....	4-12
References .....	4-36
Index.....	4-69

### **Appendix A – Reasons for Scheduling the Environmental Analysis of the Big Thorne Project**

### **Appendix B – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS**

### **Appendix C – Unit and Road Changes between Draft and Final EIS**

### **Appendix D – Catalog of Past Harvest and Present and Reasonably Foreseeable Projects**

# Table of Contents

## List of Tables

Table 1-1.	Forest Plan Land Use Designations and Acreages in the Project Area.....	1-17
Table 2-1.	Comparison of Alternatives by Issue.....	2-21
Table 2-1.	Comparison of Alternatives by Issue (continued).....	2-22
Table TSE-1.	Timber Industry Employment in Southeast Alaska, 2002–2011.....	3-19
Table TSE-2.	Timber Harvest in Southeast Alaska by Ownership, 2002–2011.....	3-20
Table TSE-3.	Timber Volume Estimates by Species and Alternative.....	3-23
Table TSE-4.	Proposed Logging System and Silvicultural System by Alternative ...	3-24
Table TSE-5.	Old-growth Stump to Truck Average Logging Costs.....	3-25
Table TSE-6.	Young-growth Stump to Truck Average Logging Costs.....	3-27
Table TSE-7.	Proposed Road Construction and Reconstruction by Alternative.....	3-30
Table TSE-8.	Road Storage and Decommissioning Costs by Alternative.....	3-30
Table TSE-9.	Average Truck Speeds Used for Analysis.....	3-31
Table TSE-10.	Pond Log Values by Species and Alternative.....	3-31
Table TSE-11.	Proposed Harvest Acres and Volumes in Phase 2 Lands.....	3-33
Table TSE-12.	Costs and Values by Alternative.....	3-35
Table TSE-13.	Estimated Timber Volume, Employment, and Income by Alternative.....	3-36
Table TSE-14.	Estimated Forest Service Financial Costs and Revenues by Alternative.....	3-37
Table OGR-1.	Forest Plan Land Use Designation Acreage in the Project Area by Alternative.....	3-52
Table OGR-2.	Comparison of Old-growth Reserves Based On Forest Plan Design Criteria.....	3-55
Table OGR-3.	Acres and Volume of Potential Mapped Suitable Timber Within Each Small OGR by Alternative, Change in Mapped Suitable and Available Timber, and Summary Statistics.....	3-82
Table OGR-4.	Effects of OGR Modifications on the Number of Units, Acres and Volume by VCU and Summary by Alternative for the Big Thorne project.....	3-83
Table WLD-1.	Existing Total, High-Volume, and Large-Tree POG by Biogeographic Province, VCU, and Project Area.....	3-104
Table WLD-2.	Number of POG Patches and Acreages by Size Class Intersecting the Big Thorne Project Area under Existing Conditions.....	3-107
Table WLD-3.	Existing Deer Winter Habitat Capability on NFS Lands by WAA.....	3-112
Table WLD-4.	Existing Average Snow Winter Habitat, Deep Snow Winter Habitat, and Non-Winter Habitat on NFS and Non-NFS Lands by WAA.....	3-113
Table WLD-5.	Existing Deer Winter Habitat Capability in terms of Deer Density on NFS Lands by WAA.....	3-115
Table WLD-6.	Existing Road Density below 1,200 Feet Elevation on NFS Lands ..	3-117
Table WLD-7.	Original and Existing Deep Snow Marten Habitat.....	3-118
Table WLD-8.	Existing Road Density for All Elevations on NFS Lands.....	3-120
Table WLD-9.	Priority Landbird Species Potentially Occurring in the Big Thorne Project Area.....	3-128
Table WLD-10.	Threatened, Endangered, Candidate, and Alaska Region Sensitive Species in the Big Thorne Project Area.....	3-130

## Table of Contents

Table WLD-11.	Landscape Composition in Relation to Goshawk Habitat Requirements .....	3-134
Table WLD-12.	Total Deer Harvested and Annual Average Reported for Communities using the Project Area WAAs between 1996 and 2003 .....	3-137
Table WLD-13.	Harvest of Total POG by Biogeographic Province, VCU, and Project Area for Each Alternative .....	3-139
Table WLD-14.	Harvest of High-volume POG (SD 5S, 5N, 67) by Biogeographic Province, VCU, and Project Area for Each Alternative .....	3-140
Table WLD-15.	Harvest of Large Tree POG (SD 67) by Biogeographic Province, VCU, and Project Area for Each Alternative .....	3-141
Table WLD-16.	Cumulative POG Harvest by Alternative .....	3-144
Table WLD-17.	Number of POG Patches and POG acres within Patches by Size Class by Alternative for Direct and Cumulative Effects.....	3-147
Table WLD-18.	Comparison of Effects to Corridors with Project Effects by Alternative .....	3-155
Table WLD-19.	Relative Changes in Deer Habitat Capability (DHC) by WAA by Alternative for NFS Lands Only .....	3-166
Table WLD-20.	Changes to Average Snow Winter Range, Deep Snow Winter Range, and Non-Winter Habitat for Deer by WAA by Alternative (NFS and Non-NFS Lands).....	3-167
Table WLD-21.	Relative Changes Deer Habitat Capability (DHC) by WAA by Alternative for All Lands (NFS and Non-NFS Lands) Including Reasonably Foreseeable Projects .....	3-168
Table WLD-22.	Cumulative Effects to Average Snow Winter Habitat, Deep Snow Winter Habitat, and Non-Winter Habitat for Deer by WAA and by Alternative on all Lands (NFS and Non-NFS Lands) Including Reasonably Foreseeable Projects .....	3-169
Table WLD-23.	Harvest by Prescription by WAA .....	3-171
Table WLD-24.	Effects of Timber Harvest on Deer Density by WAA (NFS Lands Only) .....	3-177
Table WLD-25.	Road Density below 1,200 feet Elevation on NFS Lands Only after Implementation of the Alternatives.....	3-179
Table WLD-26.	Cumulative Impacts to Deer Habitat Capability by WAA (NFS and Non-NFS Lands) .....	3-180
Table WLD-27.	Cumulative Road Density on All Ownerships Below 1,200 Feet Elevation by Alternative .....	3-183
Table WLD-28.	Impacts to Deep Snow Marten Habitat by WAA and by Alternative .	3-192
Table WLD-29.	Road Density at All Elevations on NFS Lands Only after Implementation of the Alternatives.....	3-192
Table WLD-30.	Cumulative Effects to Deep Snow Marten Habitat by WAA and by Alternative .....	3-193
Table WLD-31.	Cumulative Road Density on All Ownerships at All Elevations by Alternative .....	3-194
Table WLD-32.	Productive Old-growth Harvest by WAA under each Alternative .....	3-201
Table WLD-33.	Cumulative POG Harvest by WAA.....	3-201
Table WLD-34.	Direct and Cumulative Effects to Interior Forest by Alternative .....	3-208
Table WLD-35.	Summary of Effects Determinations for Threatened, Endangered, Candidate, and Sensitive Species .....	3-231
Table WLD-36.	Landscape Composition Resulting from the Alternatives .....	3-235
Table WLD-37.	Cumulative Effects to Landscape Composition by Alternative.....	3-236

# Table of Contents

Table WLD-38.	Hunter Demand by WAA of Current (2013) and Projected Deer Habitat Capability by Alternative (NFS and non-NFS lands) Incorporating Past and Foreseeable Projects .....	3-245
Table WTR-1.	Watershed Issues/Concerns Addressed and Environmental Components Analyzed for the Big Thorne Project Area .....	3-257
Table WTR-2.	Subwatersheds Affected by Big Thorne Project Alternatives .....	3-262
Table WTR-3.	Past Harvest in Subwatersheds Affected by Big Thorne Project Alternatives.....	3-265
Table WTR-4.	Existing Roads in Subwatersheds Affected by Big Thorne Project Alternatives.....	3-271
Table WTR-5.	Past Riparian Harvest in Subwatersheds Affected by Big Thorne Project Alternatives.....	3-274
Table WTR-6.	Proposed Harvest (including road clearing) by Big Thorne Project Alternatives in Affected Subwatersheds .....	3-279
Table WTR-7.	Proposed Road Construction by Big Thorne Project Alternatives ....	3-287
Table WTR-8.	Proposed Road-Stream Crossings by Big Thorne Project Alternatives in Affected Watersheds.....	3-291
Table WTR-9.	Cumulative Harvest by Big Thorne Project Alternative.....	3-295
Table WTR-10.	Cumulative Percent Road Area by Big Thorne Project Alternatives.	3-297
Table WTR-11.	Direct, Indirect, and Cumulative Effects by Big Thorne Project Alternatives in Affected Subwatersheds .....	3-299
Table KST-1.	Changes to Total Harvest on Karst for the Big Thorne Project Area	3-316
Table SOIL-1.	Existing Soil Disturbance in Big Thorne Project Area.....	3-320
Table SOIL-2.	Total Mapped Landslides within the Big Thorne Project Area.....	3-321
Table SOIL-3.	Landslides in Harvested Areas and Non-Harvested POG during the Past 40 Years (1971-2010) .....	3-321
Table SOIL-4.	Estimated Acres of Detrimental Soil Conditions from Implementation of the Alternatives .....	3-324
Table SOIL-5.	Proposed Harvest Unit Acreage with Slopes Greater than 72% that Meet the Slope Stability Analysis Criteria for Timber Harvest (old-growth harvest and young growth thinning) .....	3-325
Table SOIL-6.	Estimated Acres of Cumulative Detrimental Soil Disturbance by Alternative.....	3-329
Table FISH-1.	Brief Description of Process Groups .....	3-339
Table FISH-2.	Stream Miles by Process Group by Subwatershed .....	3-341
Table FISH-3.	Known Stream Miles by AHMU Class and Basin Area by Subwatershed.....	3-342
Table FISH-4.	Lake Area by AHMU Class in the Project Area Subwatersheds .....	3-343
Table FISH-5.	Known Anadromous and Resident Fish Species Presence by Subwatershed in the Project Affected Area.....	3-345
Table FISH-6.	Fish Passage in the Project Area by Subwatershed .....	3-348
Table FISH-7.	Changes in Red Culvert Status by Alternative in the Big Thorne Project Area.....	3-351
Table WET-1.	Existing Road Construction and Timber Harvest on Wetlands.....	3-360
Table WET-2.	Road and Timber Harvesting Impacts on Wetland Types by Action Alternative.....	3-362
Table WET-3.	Estimated Acres of Cumulative (Existing, Project, and Foreseeable) Wetland Impacts from Harvesting by Alternative .....	3-367
Table BOT-1.	Known or Suspected Sensitive Plants in the Thorne Bay Ranger District.....	3-373

## Table of Contents

Table BOT-2.	Percentage of Known Populations and Estimated Percentage of Individuals of Whiteflower Rein Orchid Directly or Indirectly Affected in the Project Area by the Big Thorne Project .....	3-386
Table BOT-3.	Percentage of Known Populations and Estimated percentage of Individuals of Lesser Round-Leaved Orchid Directly or Indirectly Affected in the Project Area by the Big Thorne Project.....	3-390
Table INV-1.	High Priority Invasive Plant Species found in the Project Area.....	3-398
Table INV-2.	Specific Invasive Plant Populations for which Treatment is Recommended.....	3-400
Table INV-3.	Summary of Harvest Unit Acres and Acres of Soil Disturbance by Logging System, Prescription, and Alternative .....	3-402
Table INV-4.	Summary of Harvest Unit Acres, Road Construction, Number of Stream Crossings, and Acres of Rock Quarry as a result of the Big Thorne Project .....	3-403
Table INV-5.	Cumulative Timber Harvesting Impacts .....	3-406
Table INV-6.	Summary of Cumulative Acres in Harvest Units, Road Construction, Number of Stream Crossings, and Acres of Rock Quarry as a result of the Big Thorne Project.....	3-407
Table TBR-1.	Original, Eliminated, and Resulting Big Thorne Unit Pool Acres .....	3-413
Table TBR-2.	Gross Volume per Acre by Volume Strata .....	3-414
Table TBR-3.	Silvicultural System Acres by Alternative and Yarding System .....	3-420
Table TBR-4.	Pre-Harvest Wind Risk Rating by Silvicultural System and Alternative (acres).....	3-433
Table TRAN-1.	Big Thorne Analysis Area NFS Roads.....	3-439
Table TRAN-2.	Big Thorne Analysis Area OBML and RMO Plan.....	3-443
Table TRAN-3.	Big Thorne Project Area Existing and Proposed Roads .....	3-446
Table TRAN-4.	Big Thorne Road Development Costs .....	3-446
Table TRAN-5.	Estimated Costs of Road Storage and Decommissioning .....	3-452
Table TRAN-6.	Travel Management Plan for Project Area NFS Roads after Implementation of Proposed RMOs (miles) .....	3-452
Table REC-1.	ROS Designations within the Big Thorne Project Area.....	3-455
Table REC-2.	Developed Recreation Sites in the Big Thorne Project Area .....	3-459
Table REC-3.	Estimated Use of Undeveloped Recreation Sites in the Big Thorne Project Area Identified as Receiving Consistent Use.....	3-462
Table REC-4.	Outfitter and Guide Locations and Use in the Big Thorne Project Area .....	3-463
Table REC-5.	ROS Settings by Alternative .....	3-464
Table SCEN-1.	Scenic Integrity Objectives (SIOs) for the Primary LUDs in the Project Area as Identified in the Forest Plan.....	3-475
Table SCEN-2.	Acreage of Scenic Integrity Objectives (SIOs) in the Project Area ...	3-478
Table SCEN-3.	Existing Visual Condition/Existing Scenic Integrity in the Project Area .....	3-479
Table SCEN-4.	Clearcut (CC) and Partial Cut (PC) Harvest Acreage for Old Growth by Scenery Integrity Objective under the Action Alternatives .....	3-485
Table SCEN-5.	Road Construction (Con) and Reconstruction (Rec) Mileage by Scenery Integrity Objective under the Action Alternatives .....	3-485

# Table of Contents

Table SCEN-6	Cumulative Visual Disturbance in terms of Cumulative VCU Harvest (<30 yr-old young growth) and Percent of VCU Area Harvested for All Lands (includes past harvest, future Big Thorne clearcut harvest, other future NFS harvest, and future State harvest) .....	3-491
Table IRA-1.	Roadless Characteristics and Discussion Sections.....	3-493
Table IRA-2.	Inventoried Roadless Areas Located within the Big Thorne Project Area (partially or wholly) .....	3-494
Table IRA-3.	Kogish IRA Acres by LUD .....	3-496
Table IRA-4.	Karta IRA Acres by LUD .....	3-498
Table IRA-5.	Thorne River IRA Acres by LUD.....	3-500
Table IRA-6.	Ratz IRA Acres by LUD .....	3-502
Table IRA-7.	Area of Influence by Alternative (acres) .....	3-504
Table WSR-1.	Harvest and Thinning Acres Proposed within the Recreational River LUD .....	3-509
Table SOC-1.	Population, 2000 and 2010.....	3-517
Table SOC-2.	Race and Ethnicity 2010.....	3-518
Table SOC-3.	Annual Employment and Earnings in the Prince of Wales-Hyder CA, 2011.....	3-519

# Table of Contents

## List of Figures

Figure 1-1.	Project Area and Vicinity Map.....	1-3
Figure 1-2.	Big Thorne Project Area Land Use Designations and Inventoried Roadless Areas – Existing Conditions.....	1-16
Figure 2-1.	Alternative 3 LUD Map and Inventoried Roadless Areas after OGR Modifications (compare with Figure 1-2, the Existing LUD Map) .....	2-9
Figure 2-2.	Alternative 4 LUD Map and Inventoried Roadless Areas after OGR Modifications (compare with Figure 1-2, the Existing LUD Map) .....	2-11
Figure 3-1.	Wildlife Analysis Areas (WAAs) in the Big Thorne Project Area.....	3-3
Figure OGR-1.	Existing Old-growth Reserves in the Big Thorne Project Area .....	3-47
Figure OGR-2.	Old-growth Reserves under Alternative 3 in the Big Thorne Project Area .....	3-62
Figure OGR-3.	Small Old-growth Reserves under Alternative 3 in the North Portion of the Big Thorne Project Area Showing LUD Changes.....	3-63
Figure OGR-4.	Small Old-growth Reserves under Alternative 3 in the Central Portion of the Big Thorne Project Area Showing LUD Changes.....	3-64
Figure OGR-5.	Small Old-growth Reserves under Alternative 3 in the South Portion of the Big Thorne Project Area Showing LUD Changes.....	3-65
Figure OGR-6.	Old-growth Reserves under Alternative 4 in the Big Thorne Project Area .....	3-73
Figure OGR-7.	Small Old-growth Reserves under Alternative 4 in the North Portion of the Big Thorne Project Area Showing LUD Changes.....	3-74
Figure OGR-8.	Small Old-growth Reserves under Alternative 4 in the Central Portion of the Big Thorne Project Area Showing LUD Changes.....	3-75
Figure OGR-9.	Small Old-growth Reserves under Alternative 4 in the South Portion of the Big Thorne Project Area Showing LUD Changes.....	3-76
Figure WLD-1.	Probable Wildlife Movement Corridors within the Big Thorne Project Area .....	3-108
Figure WTR-1.	Watersheds within the Big Thorne Project Area .....	3-260
Figure WTR-2.	Subwatersheds within the Big Thorne Project Area.....	3-261
Figure WTR-3.	Typical Streamflow Regime in Watersheds and Subwatersheds Affected by Big Thorne Project Alternatives .....	3-263
Figure KST-1.	Geologic Map of the Big Thorne Project Area .....	3-314
Figure TBR-1.	Current NFS Land Classifications in the Big Thorne Project Area....	3-411
Figure TBR-2.	Big Thorne Project Area Harvest Acres by Decade .....	3-415
Figure REC-1.	Recreation Opportunity Spectrum Settings within the Big Thorne Project Area .....	3-456
Figure REC-2.	Recreation Sites in the Big Thorne Project Area .....	3-458
Figure SCEN-1.	Major Visual Priority Routes and Use Areas in Big Thorne Project Area .....	3-477
Figure SCEN-2.	Scenic Integrity Objectives in the Big Thorne Project Area .....	3-480
Figure SCEN-3.	Scenic Integrity Objectives with Alternative 3 in the Big Thorne Project Area .....	3-483
Figure SCEN-4.	Scenic Integrity Objectives with Alternative 4 in the Big Thorne Project Area .....	3-484
Figure IRA-1.	Inventoried Roadless Areas in the Big Thorne Project Area.....	3-495